



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,932	11/26/2003	Saravanakumar V. Tiruthani	2003P00078US	9779

7590 03/30/2007
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,932

Applicant(s)

TIRUTHANI, SARAVANAKUMAR
V.

Examiner

Joseph E. Avellino

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/26/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination; claims 1, 5, and 11 independent.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The IDS submitted November 26, 2003 has been considered. See enclosed PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. The claim states "said one or more function parameters comprises are implemented" which is unclear. It cannot be determined from the scope of the claim as to what is actually being claimed. For examination purposes, it is believed to be a typographical error and will be construed as the defining steps are implemented on a plurality of systems. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berman (USPN 5,754,831).

6. Berman discloses a telecommunications method comprising:

defining one or more system components (i.e. network elements 310-340) using a module definition language (the Office construes the phrase “module definition language” as any text, script, program, etc. which can be utilized in order to simulate, emulate, or model a particular element) (i.e. defining network elements) (col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 9 and also disclosed in Application no. 08/641,599, Patent no. 5,845,124: col. 2, lines 20-29);

defining one or more system parameters (i.e. characteristics of network elements) for said one or more system components) (col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 9);

implementing the function defined for the system component (i.e. “as message traverses network model, it experiences mathematically computed delays”) (col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 13); and

logging a result of said implementing (i.e. "a timestamp is again generated...an average timestamp is determined") (col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berman.

8. Referring to claims 3 and 4, Berman discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Berman does not explicitly state that the predetermined functions include CPU load and delay, however it is well known for modeling purposes that CPU functionalities can be implemented in a modeling environment. By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the features and advantages of providing for modeling CPU load and delay is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Berman in order to model parameters of the CPU of the various networking elements since Berman discloses that the parameters can include element speeds, capacities, or *any suitable measurable characteristics of the same* (col. 6, lines 57-60). This would motivate one of ordinary

skill in the art to include these modeling parameters in the system of Berman in order to implement a more efficient system customizable to the user.

Claims 2, and 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berman in view of Takahashi et al. (USPN 7,031,895) (hereinafter Takahashi).

9. Referring to claim 2, Berman discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Berman does not explicitly state that the defining steps are implemented on a plurality of systems. In analogous art, Takahashi discloses another telecommunications method which implements defining components and defining functions are implemented on a plurality of systems (i.e. multiple model generators 51a-c implemented in networks a-c) (Figure 8; col. 15, lines 4-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Takahashi with Berman in order to provide simulations based on actual results of the network rather than arbitrary values assigned by the user, thereby providing a real basis for the network simulation and providing more reasonable results for the network model.

10. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

11. Referring to claim 7, Berman-Takahishi discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 6. Berman-Takahishi does not explicitly disclose that the model definition language is an XML-based model definition language, however XML model

definition language, however XML is a well known markup language which is known for simulation. By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concepts and advantages of using XML based model definition language as the model definition language is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Berman-Takahishi to implement XML based modeling language in order to provide an efficient method of implementation of modeling and simulation, which can be easily extensible to model further parameters of the device.

12. Claims 8-11 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

13. Referring to claim 12, Berman (Patent no. 5,845,124 incorporated by reference) discloses a directory defining a name and parameters of other modules being modeled by the system which a given model needs to work with (i.e. define interconnections between network elements that are visually implied but not explicitly shown) (Berman '124, Figure 4; col. 8, lines 15-25). Furthermore Takahashi discloses the use of a path appliance list which defines the list of elements within the path (e.g. abstract).

14. Referring to claim 13, Berman discloses a loop module for modeling a non-real time component (Berman, Patent no. 5,845,124 incorporated by reference into Berman discloses modeling a client machine session which conducts 5 transactions a minute,

Art Unit: 2143

thereby looping and issuing a new transaction every twenty seconds: Fig. 9A, attributes 900).

15. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Avellino', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Joseph E. Avellino, Examiner
March 22, 2007